

REMARKS

The examiner has objected to the drawings in several respects. FIG. 1 has been amended as requested by the examiner, to add a designation of “BACKGROUND ART” to the figure. FIGS. 1-5 have been carefully compared to the text of the specification, and two minor amendments made to make the drawings and text consistent. The examiner indicates that “several reference signs in figures 1-5 fails to show detailed description as described in the specification” We interpreted this as an indication that it appeared that several elements of the drawings identified with reference numerals did not find corresponding disclosure in the specification. This occurred only once, in FIG. 3, with reference numeral 208, and an amendment has been made to the specification to add reference to element 208. In one other instance, mention was added of reference numeral 310 the first time that the element in question is referenced (even though numeral 310 is used later on).

The examiner has rejected the independent claims (1, 14) under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lim (US 2005/0041734). The examiner is urged to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

The invention of claim 1 concerns a clever technique for “communicating additional bits from a transmitting station to a receiving station without transmitting the additional bits”. This bit of magic is achieved by having the transmitter derive the error checking bits from the additional bits using an error checking process. Then, the receiver uses the same or a related error checking process to process candidate bits known to the receiving station, and comparing the output of the error checking process to the error checking bits received to see if the candidate bits correspond to the additional bits.

For example, a destination address for a packet could be the additional bits. The transmitter uses the destination address with the packet body to generate the error checking bits. Then, stations receiving the packet use their address as the candidate bits, and produce error checking bits from the combination of the packet body and the destination address. If the error checking bits that are produced match those received, the station knows that the packet was sent to it. And this is all achieved without actually transmitting the destination address.

Lim teaches nothing even remotely relevant to the invention of claim 1. Lim is simply a system for storing data in what is commonly known as a hash table. A data item (a long MAC address in Lim's case) is converted to a shorter hash of the data item, and the data item is stored at the address specified by the hash. If it turns out that the storage space at the hash location is already occupied, a further hash is performed to choose a new storage location.

There is no suggestion anywhere in Lim of a means of communicating bits without actually transmitting them. There is no suggestion of performing an error checking process at a transmitter using the additional bits along with the bits being transmitted. Nor is there any suggestion of using candidate bits at the receiver with the same or related error checking process to ascertain whether the candidate bits are the same as the additional bits. In short, Lim is totally irrelevant.

The invention of claim 14 calls for using a "substantially unique number" to acknowledge receipt of a group of bits (e.g., a packet). A transmitter sending the group of bits (e.g., the packet) sends the "substantially unique number" along with the group of bits. The receiver acknowledges receipt of the group of bits by transmitting the substantially unique number.

Again, Lim teaches nothing that has any bearing on the claimed invention. In Lim, a data item is stored in a hash table at an address specified by a hash of the data item. This produces more compact storage, without the large number of empty storage locations that would otherwise result. None of that has anything to do with transmissions and acknowledgements, and certainly nothing to do with sending a substantially unique number in a transmission and returning it in an acknowledgement.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

The remaining claims are all properly dependent on claims 1 and 14, and thus allowable therewith. Each of the dependent claims adds one or more further limitations that enhance patentability, but those limitations are not presently relied upon. For that reason, and not because applicants agree with the examiner, no rebuttal is offered to the examiner's reasons for rejecting the dependent claims.

Allowance of the application is requested.

Applicant : Lawrence W. Yonge III et al.
Serial No. : 10/720,016
Filed : November 20, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 04838-076001

Enclosed is a check for \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/5/2006

/grogerlee/

G. Roger Lee
Reg. No. 28,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21444800.doc

Applicant : Lawrence W. Yonge III et al.
Serial No. : 10/720,016
Filed : November 20, 2003
Page : 4 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 04838-076001

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

Figure 1 has been designated with the legend --Background Art--.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)